
Point-Factor Evaluations of Elected Officials' Positions

Evaluation Recommendations
and Supporting Rationale

Conducted by the Washington
State Department of Personnel
February 2007

Table of Contents

Section 1:	Background	3
Section II:	Willis Point-Factor Evaluation-Methodology and Approach	4
Section III:	Evaluation Recommendations and Rationale	5
	- Exhibit A Evaluation Points and Equivalent Plateaus of Elected Officials	6
Section IV:	Appendix	7
	A. Compensable Factors and Category Descriptions	8
	B. Willis Job Evaluation Chart of Proposed Evaluated Points and Salary Plateau Comparisons of Elected Officials Compared to those of Governor – Appointed Officials	12
	C. Current Salary of Elected Officials Compared to Current Salary and Salary Plateau Maximums of Governor – Appointed Officials	14
	D. Job Descriptions of Elected Officials (Not Paged)	

Section I: Background

In August 2006 the Washington Citizen's Commission on Salaries for Elected Officials (Citizen's Commission) requested the Department of Personnel to reevaluate the positions of nine elected Officials. They included:

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Attorney General
- Superintendent of Public Instruction
- State Treasurer
- Insurance Commissioner
- State Auditor
- Secretary of State
- Commissioner of Public Lands

Elected officials from the State Legislature and Judiciary are not included within the scope of this study.

During the 2005 salary setting session, Citizen's Commission Commissioners expressed concern that the responsibilities of some positions had changed since their initial evaluation conducted in 2003. They requested a re-evaluation of the Executive Branch positions prior to the 2007 salary setting session.

Cary Randow, State Compensation Manager for the Department of Personnel (DOP), conducted the original baseline evaluations. He was asked by the Citizen's Commission to consult with and advise the Commission on the results of his evaluations. In preparation for this evaluation DOP reviewed updated job descriptions provided by each elected official under review. Changes in job scope and responsibilities, where noted, were discussed with the Human Resource Managers of those elected officials. Each position was then reevaluated. Where evaluations differed from the previous evaluation, a more thorough review of each evaluation factor was made to assure consistency. The results of these evaluations resulted in point value changes in six positions resulting in higher plateau placement.

This report is organized into four sections. **Section I – Background** identifies the elected officials whose positions are re-evaluated and provides a summary of the evaluation process. **Section II – Willis Point Factor Evaluation Methodology and Approach** provides a summary overview of the Willis Point Factor System used to make the evaluation determinations. **Section III – Evaluation Recommendations and Rationale** identifies the recommended evaluations and accompanying rationale. **Section IV – Appendix** provides Willis job evaluation methodology, evaluation points and salary comparisons between elected and Governor-appointed (appointed) officials and job descriptions for each elected official covered under this review.

Section II: Willis Point-Factor Evaluation Methodology and Approach

The Willis Point-Factor Evaluation System (Willis System) was developed by Mr. Norm Willis, Willis and Associates, in the late 1960's and has been utilized by the State of Washington for evaluating appointed state agency executives since the mid-1970's. Mr. Norm Willis and Mr. Fred Owen, his associate, conducted the initial evaluations. With the retirement of Mr. Willis in 1991, Fred Owen, now of Owen-Pottier Associates, has provided consulting support to the Department of Personnel on revisions to existing or new evaluations of appointed officials. Mr. Owen has conducted studies for the Citizen's Commission as well as performed job evaluations on elected official's positions in the State Legislature and the Judiciary. The Willis System uses specific criteria called Compensable Factors (factors) to measure the relative value of work assigned to a job. Relative value levels within each factor are assigned specific points. The total points assigned to a job determine its location in the pay structure.

There are three primary factors and seven other sub-factors used in the evaluation methodology and process. Each factor or sub-factor represents an independent and measurable requirement or characteristic that is present in all jobs being evaluated; is clearly defined, nondiscriminatory, and measures only one basic dimension of job value. . Each factor has specific measurement criteria used to determine the most appropriate value level. The three Compensable Factors used in the Willis System are:

1) Knowledge and Skills, 2) Mental Demands, and 3) Accountability. Descriptions of Compensable Factors and categories of measurement are found in **Appendix A – Compensable Factors and Category Descriptions**.

Section III: Evaluation Recommendations and Rationale

The recommended evaluation points and plateau comparisons with appointed officials were determined through the application of the Willis System. The following information was used in these recommendations:

- Job descriptions of elected officials provided by the Commission.
- Specific discussions with Human Resource representatives of the elected officials evaluated
- Existing evaluations of appointed officials.

This evaluation review was last conducted in November 2003. The last four years have brought significant changes to the type and scope of job responsibilities of many elected officials' positions and has also increased the impact of their decisions/actions on our state's citizens and businesses.

Resultantly, six of the nine elected official positions have evaluated out at higher point values. These positions are: Lieutenant Governor, Commissioner of Public Lands, Insurance Commissioner, Secretary of State, State Treasurer and State Auditor. Current (2003) and recommended (2006) point values and their respective plateaus/grades are identified in **Exhibit A – Evaluation Points and Equivalent Plateaus of Elected Officials**. Each position evaluated at a higher point value did so as a result of one or more of the following considerations:

- Addition of a new and significant job responsibility
- Increased accountability and financial or policy impact of decisions upon the state's citizens, and/or businesses and state government operations
- Effect a more proper job value alignment within elected officials' positions.

The applicability of one or more of these areas resulted in the acknowledgement of higher levels of problem solving and accountability and the resultant assignment of a higher point value and plateau/grade level. While these evaluations and plateau recommendations are advisory in nature, they do allow for consistent and relevant comparison within the elected officials positions as well as a comparison to the appointed officials for pay alignment and pay equity purposes. **Appendix B – Willis Job Evaluation Chart of Proposed Evaluated Points and Salary Plateau Comparisons of Elected Officials Compared to those of Governor -- Appointed Officials** provides an intergraded comparison of the evaluation points and resultant plateaus between elected and appointed officials. **Appendix C - Current Salary of Elected Officials Compared to Current Salary and Salary Plateau Maximums of Governor - Appointed Officials** provides a salary and salary range maximum comparison of these same executives.

Exhibit A

Evaluation Points and Equivalent Plateaus of Elected Officials

	<u>2003</u>		<u>2006</u>	
	Point	Equivalent	Point	Equivalent
<u>Position</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Plateau</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Plateau</u>
Governor	7072	NA	7072	NA
Lieutenant Governor	1528	C	2048	B
Attorney General	3376	A	3376	A
Superintendent of Public Instruction	2688	A-	2688	A-
Commissioner of Public Lands	2464	B+	2688	A-
Insurance Commissioner	2144	B	2336	B+
Secretary of State	1976	B	2224	B+
Treasurer	1976	B	2224	B+
Auditor	1896	B	2224	B+

Note: NA – Not assigned a plateau level

Section IV: Appendix

Appendix A	Compensable Factors and Category Descriptions
Appendix B	Willis Job Evaluation Chart of Proposed Evaluated Points and Salary Plateau Comparisons of Elected Officials Compared to those of Governor -- Appointed Officials
Appendix C	Current Salary of Elected Officials Compared to Current Salary and Salary Plateau Maximums of Governor - Appointed Officials
Appendix D	Job Descriptions of Elected Officials Governor Lieutenant Governor Attorney General Superintendent of Public Instruction Commissioner of Public Lands Insurance Commissioner Secretary of State State Treasurer State Auditor

Appendix A: Compensable Factors and Category Descriptions

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Every position requires a given amount of Knowledge and Skills for acceptable job performance. An incumbent must possess certain knowledge and abilities to be able to meet the job's requirements and responsibilities. It does not matter how these skills and knowledge are obtained – they could be by formal education, specialized training, or job related experience. The Knowledge and Skills component evaluates the position in relation to three dimensions: **Job Knowledge, Managerial Skills, and Interpersonal Skills.**

Job Knowledge

This category measures the amount of specialized or technical knowledge required. It is measured in breadth (comprehensiveness) and depth (thoroughness). The process involved in evaluating this dimension, therefore, requires two major judgements:

1. What is the complexity of the subject matter(s) with which the position must be familiar?
2. How knowledgeable must the incumbent be in that field (or fields)?

Managerial Skills

The category deals with the nature and complexity of the management process required of the position. Management, in these terms, is defined strictly as the exercise of all elements of management – planning, organizing, executing, controlling and evaluating activities, functions, and sub functions.

Three considerations are applied:

1. The complexity of the management function.
2. The extent of harmonizing or blending different, diverse, or even competing functions or sub functions to achieve desired results.
3. The amount of impact of the managerial function on the organization.

Interpersonal Skills

This category measures the direct people contact or human relations skills required of a position. It deals with the extent to which the position must be able to establish rapport with, empathize with, and influence the actions of others.

MENTAL DEMANDS

This second factor measures the requirements to analyze alternatives and to solve problems. All incumbents do some thinking as part of their jobs, but the level of thinking required varies widely between positions.

A position incumbent is required to think and solve problems with what he or she is required to know. Therefore, Mental Demands is treated as a percentage utilization of Knowledge and Skills.

Mental Demands (continued)

This component has two categories: **Independent Judgement and Problem.**

Independent Judgment

This category can be thought of as setting the stage for problem solving. What is measured here is the opportunity for thinking permitted by the position's characteristics and role in the organization.

Conversely, this factor can be viewed as the amount of structure and guides available – or lack thereof – in dealing with problems.

In locating the appropriate Independent Judgment level for a given position, the following definitions will be helpful:

- **Procedure** – a manner or way of proceeding; a step-by-step course of action.
- **Policy** – a settled course adopted by management to be followed throughout the organization.
- **Goal** – an expected end result, generally of long-range duration. For our purposes, however, it may be a specific short-range objective, identifying both time and target.

Problem Solving

This category measures the nature and complexity of the problems the position encounters and must solve. Three elements should be considered:

- The amount and depth of analysis the position is required to perform.
- The nature of the problems to be solved and the complexity of the data.
- The extent of evaluative, innovative, or creative thinking required.

As with Independent Judgement, it is helpful to define the key terms used in the Problem Solving slots:

Analysis – The separation of a problem or situation into its component parts.

Evaluation – To assign values, such as weighing the relative advantages of different and/or competing alternatives.

Creative – The establishment of new, rather than imitative, concepts or approaches.

ACCOUNTABILITY

The first two factors measure a job's complexity; the third, Accountability, evaluates the expected results. All jobs exist in the organization to accomplish an end result; if they did not, they would not exist. Accountability is the measure of a job's reason for existence in the organization. Accountability is evaluated in three categories:

Freedom to Take Action, Size of Impact, and Nature of Impact.

Freedom to Take Action

Freedom to Take Action is quantitatively the most important aspect of Accountability. This dimension measures the existence or absence of personal or procedural restraints, i.e., how much latitude does the incumbent have to do the job. Conceptually, this factor is similar to Independent Judgement in that it deals with the amount of latitude permitted a position, and the definitions of the levels have much in common.

The important difference is here we are considering freedom to get things accomplished as opposed to the pure thinking environment. As a general guideline, it is unlikely to find a position with more Freedom to Take Action than Independent Judgement.

Several things are to be observed: Normally, there are fewer levels within this dimension than there are organization echelons. Therefore, it is not uncommon for two organizational levels (superior and subordinate) to have the same Freedom to Take Action designation.

Controls over action may be supervisory or procedural or both. The amount of direct supervision over a position limits Freedom to Take Action. More commonly, controls are built into the work process itself in the form of rules and procedures. Therefore, in each level both types of controls must be considered. These criteria are not always present in combination; one or the other may be present.

Size of Impact and Nature of Impact

These two subcategories are interrelated and must therefore be considered together in order to determine what makes the most sense. They measure:

- The size of the end results the position most clearly is designed to have an impact on, and,
- The extent of accountability for those end results.

The measurement of Size and Nature of Impact must be taken at the point representing the position's most significant influence upon the organization. It relates to the basic reason the job exists.

Accountability (continued)

Size of Impact

The simplest way to look at Size of Impact is to say the job most clearly impacts something big or something little, or something in-between. To give uniform definition to this dimension, the degrees of size may be generally related to annualized dollars entrusted to or affected by the position under examination. They may reflect objectives (service quotas, for example); or stewardship (operating budgets, for example); or spheres of influence (total operating revenues, for example).

Nature of Impact

The three types of Impact; Serving, Influencing, or directing express the main kinds of Accountability a position can have on a chosen end result. For an end result of any consequence, a number of positions are involved, all making some kind of contribution. Many people can properly claim Accountability for an end result provided the Impact of each position's Accountability is known.

Appendix B: Willis Job Evaluation Chart of Proposed Evaluated Points and Salary Plateau Comparisons of Elected Officials Compared to those of Governor -- Appointed Officials

	Salary Plateau	Evaluation Points
Governor	N/A	7072
Social & Health Services	A	3536
Transportation	A	3376
Attorney General	A	3376
Office of Financial Management	A	3232
Corrections	A-	2832
Ecology	A-	2704
Labor & Industries	A-	2704
Supt. Of Public Instruction	A-	2688
Information Services	A-	2688
Commissioner of Public Lands	B+	2464
Employment Security	B+	2352
Revenue	B+	2352
Health	B+	2352
Personnel	B+	2352
State Patrol	B+	2352
Fish & Wildlife	B+	2352
Comm., Trade & Econ. Dev.	B+	2352
Insurance Commissioner	B+	2336
Early Learning, Dept. of	B+	2256
State Treasurer	B+	2224
Secretary of State	B+	2224
State Auditor	B+	2224
General Administration	B	2176
Veterans Affairs	B	2048
Utilities and Transportation	B	2048
Lieutenant Governor	B	2048
Retirement Systems	B	1968
Health Care Authority	B	1968
Financial Institutions	B	1968
Parks and Recreation	B	1968
Licensing	B	1968
Agriculture	B	1896
State Lottery	B	1896
Industrial Insurance Appeals Board Chair	B-	1784
Administrative Hearings	B-	1712
Environmental Hearings Office Chair	C	1552
Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board	C	1552
State Library	C	1528
Criminal Justice Training Commission	C	1528
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council	C	1472
Interagency Commission For Outdoor Recreation	C	1472
Liquor Control Board Chair	C	1432
Growth Management Hearings Board	C	1432
Public Employee Relations Commission	C	1432

	Salary Plateau	Evaluation Points
Human Rights Commission	D	1328
WA State Historical Society	D	1248
State Printer	D	1240
Public Disclosure Commission	D	1200
Tax Appeals Board Chair	D	1200
Indeterminate Sentence Review Board Chair	D	1200
Personnel Appeals Board Chair	D	1200
Pollution Liability Insurance Agency	E	1160
Personnel Appeals Board Executive Secretary	E	1160
Services for the Blind	E	1120
State Conservation Commission	E	1120
Traffic Safety Commission	E	1088
Minority and Women's Business Enterprise	E	1048
Eastern Washington Historical Society	E	1012
Sentencing Guidelines Commission	E	1976
Board of Accountancy	E	944
Arts Commission	F	880
Horse Racing Commission	F	824
Council on Child Abuse and Neglect	G	736
African American Affairs	G	688
Hispanic Affairs	G	688
Asian American Affairs	G	688
Board for Volunteer Firemen	G	688

Appendix C - Current Salary of Elected Officials Compared to Current Salary and Salary Plateau Maximums of Governor - Appointed Officials

Executive Job Title	Salary Plateau	Evaluation Points (New Proposed)	Current Salary	Current Maximum Salary
Governor	N/A	7072	150995	150995
Social & Health Services	A	3536	158000	185000
Transportation	A	3376	162560	185000
Attorney General (A)	A	3376	137268	137268
Office of Financial Management	A	3232	158000	185000
Corrections	A-	2832	137160	147000
Ecology	A-	2704	137160	147000
Labor & Industries	A-	2704	135000	147000
Supt. Of Public Instruction (A-)	A-	2688	107978	107978
Commissioner of Public Lands (B+)	A-	(2688)	107978	107978
Information Services	B+	2560	137160	147000
Employment Security	B+	2352	137160	147000
Revenue	B+	2352	137160	147000
Health	B+	2352	137160	147000
Personnel	B+	2352	137160	147000
State Patrol	B+	2352	137160	147000
Fish & Wildlife	B+	2352	137160	147000
Comm., Trade & Econ. Dev.	B+	2352	137160	147000
Early Learning, Dept. of	B+	2256	135000	147000
Insurance Commissioner (B)	B+	(2336)	105811	105811
Secretary of State (B)	B+	(2224)	105811	105811
State Treasurer (B)	B+	(2224)	105811	105811
State Auditor (B)	B+	(2224)	105811	105811
General Administration	B	2176	116848	126000
Veterans Affairs	B	2048	116844	126000
Utilities and Transportation	B	2048	116840	126000
Lieutenant Governor ©	B	(2048)	78930	78930
Retirement Systems	B	1968	116840	126000
Health Care Authority	B	1968	116840	126000
Financial Institutions	B	1968	116840	126000
Parks and Recreation	B	1968	116840	126000
Licensing	B	1968	116840	126000
Agriculture	B	1896	118680	126000
State Lottery	B	1896	116840	126000
Industrial Insurance Appeals Board Chair	B-	1784	94200	126000
Administrative Hearings	B-	1712	100320	126000

Executive Job Title	Salary Plateau	Evaluation Points (New Proposed)	Current Salary	Salary Range Maximum
Environmental Hearings Office Chair	C	1552	98805	110000
Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Bd.	C	1552	97536	110000
Criminal Justice Training Commission	C	1528	110000	110000
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council	C	1472	90175	110000
Interagency Commission For Outdoor Recreation	C	1472	96131	110000
Liquor Control Board Chair (60%)	C	1432	55223	110000
Growth Management Hearings Board	C	1432	92426	110000
Public Employee Relations Commission	C	1432	104852	110000
Human Rights Commission	D	1328	108000	110000
WA State Historical Society	D	1248	110000	110000
State Printer	D	1240	103200	110000
Public Disclosure Commission	D	1200	100000	110000
Tax Appeals Board Chair	D	1200	84287	110000
Indeterminate Sentence Review Board Chair	D	1200	83459	110000
Sentencing Guidelines Commission	E	1976	79000	100000
Pollution Liability Insurance Agency	E	1160	78500	100000
Services for the Blind	E	1120	83881	100000
State Conservation Commission	E	1120	86699	100000
Traffic Safety Commission	E	1088	91440	100000
Minority and Women's Business Enterprise	E	1048	78500	100000
Eastern Washington Historical Society	E	1012	100000	100000
Board of Accountancy	E	944	91440	100000
Arts Commission	F	880	77000	94000
Horse Racing Commission	F	824	89124	94000
Archaeology & Historic Preservation	F		81788	94000
Council on Child Abuse and Neglect	G	736	77004	94000
African American Affairs	G	688	77000	94000
Hispanic Affairs	G	688	77000	94000
Asian American Affairs	G	688	77000	94000
Board for Volunteer Firemen	G	688	90000	94000

Appendix D. Job Descriptions of Elected Officials

Within the attached email are the job descriptions for the following elected Officials.

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Attorney General
- Superintendent of Public Instruction
- State Treasurer
- Insurance Commissioner
- State Auditor
- Secretary of State
- Commissioner of Public Lands